

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending. Claims 1-24 have been rejected. Claims 1- 5, 8-10 and 24 have been amended for clarity. No claims have been added or cancelled. Support for the claim amendments may be found throughout the specification and figures and, for example, at Figure 1, lines 13-20 on page 7, lines 1-2 on page 8, lines 3-6 on page 16, lines 3-5 and 14-21 on page 17, lines 8-16 on page 18, line 19 of page 19- line 3 of page 20, and lines 15-21 of page 20. No new matter has been added.

Interview Summary

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Sobutka for the courtesy extended in the interview conducted on March 18, 2010. During the interview, the rejections under 35 U.S.C §112 and objections to the drawings were discussed. Examiner Sobutka agreed that the drawings on PAIR are acceptable. No replacement drawings are needed. No agreement was reached with respect to the rejections under §112, but Examiner Sobutka was helpful in facilitating and progressing the prosecution of the present application.

Objection to the Title

The Office Action objected to the title, alleging the title is not descriptive. However, Applicants submit that the claims are directed to a method and an apparatus for identifying a broadcast source, and thus the title is indicative of the claimed embodiments. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the examiner withdraw the objection.

Objections to Drawings

The Office Action objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.84 (l) and requested replacement drawings (Office Action — page 2, paragraph 3). As indicated above, Examiner Sobutka agreed that the drawings on PAIR are acceptable, and that no replacement drawings are needed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the examiner indicate the acceptance of the drawings in the next official communication.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for alleged failing to comply with the enablement requirement (Office Action – page 3, paragraph 5).

Specifically, the Office Action contends that the specification does not provide an enabling disclosure of original claim language “identifying the estimated time offset” and “the time offset defining a difference between a start time of the audio sample and the time at which the audio sample was recorded” (Office Action – page 3, paragraph 5). Applicants have amended the claims to obviate the rejections.

Specifically, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite “the audio sample being a rendition of a segment of an original recording” and “the estimated time offset of the audio sample defining a time difference between a beginning of the original recording and a beginning of the audio sample.” Independent claims 10 and 24 have been amended to recite similar subject matter. Support for the claim amendments may be found throughout the specification and figures and, for example, at Figure 1, lines 13-20 on page 7, lines 1-2 on page 8, lines 3-6 on page 16, lines 3-5 and 14-21 on page 17, lines 8-16 on page 18, line 19 of page 19- line 3 of page 20, and lines 15-21 of page 20.

In view of the foregoing amendments, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1-24 under §112 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are allowable and that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney, Lori Anne D. Swanson at (215) 568-8997, to discuss the resolution of any remaining issues.

Date: 2010-04-28

Respectfully submitted,
/Lori Anne D. Swanson/
Lori Anne D. Swanson
Registration No. 59048

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439